

TPO-0005 (contd); TPO-0006

4

1 multi-millions of, you know like in terms of  
2 magnitude, the amount of compared to what there  
3 is. Maybe not millions.

4 But I'm trying -- I'm exaggerating.  
5 But geometric amounts, more than what there  
6 already is there to make it even more  
7 difficult.

8 See, what I'd like to see happen  
9 would be that we don't be so glib about this.  
10 We don't go, "Well, we did change the statement  
11 before, so we listened. So now it's okay."

12 I don't want that to happen, because  
13 I want my kitty cat and the birds and the  
14 snakes and the people, for generations to come,  
15 to be able to live here in Oregon and be  
16 healthy and have the high quality of life that  
17 we have. Thank you.

18 MR. DEE WILLIS: How do you  
19 spell your name.

20 MS. TOBI CANTINE:  
21 C-A-N-T-I-N-E.

22 MR. DEE WILLIS: Now Doug  
23 Riggs.

24 **TPO-0006** MR. DOUG RIGGS: I like the  
25 chicken story. It's the best analogy you'll

39

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

## TPO-0006 (contd)

1 ever get.

2 My name is Doug Riggs. I'm here on  
3 behalf of the Hanford Information Network. And  
4 we've only just had an opportunity in the last  
5 several days to download the summary of the  
6 EIS. And we've taken a quick look at it.

7 None of us have actually been able  
8 to see or read through the 3,000 page document.  
9 And we'll do so, if we can bring ourselves to  
10 it, in about a week.

11 But I did want to make a few formal  
12 comments. And then we'll submit written  
13 comments by the 27th.

14 First of all, I agree with several  
15 of the speakers who say that DOE has done some  
16 work in improving the document.

17 I think for those of us who read the  
18 first document, there were some significant  
19 problems with the document.

20 It was not well written, it wasn't  
21 well organized, it was impossible to find  
22 things, and it was completely inadequate.

23 So I think that some of the things  
24 in this document, from what I've seen  
25 initially, are an improvement. We appreciate

40

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TPO-0006 (contd)

1

1 the DOE spending, obviously, a lot of time.

2 It's grown from 800 pages to 3,000  
3 pages. And it's difficult to add 2,200 pages  
4 of technical scientific material in the space  
5 of seven or eight months without doing a lot of  
6 work. So, Mike, we appreciate all the work  
7 that you've done.

8 Some of the things in the EIS, from  
9 what we've seen initially, appear to have  
10 addressed some of the concerns about lined  
11 versus unlined tanks, trenches in some cases.

12 There's an attempt to do a risk  
13 analysis. Although, Greg mentioned that he has  
14 concerns about that. And we'll take a close  
15 look at it.

16 And there is a discussion of a  
17 treatment capability that goes far beyond what  
18 was in the first document. And we think those  
19 are positive developments.

20 Unfortunately, we also think that  
21 there are several shortcomings. And I'll only  
22 go into two or three of them at this point.

2

23 There remains no significant  
24 analysis of waste from prior to 1970 for  
25 transuranic waste.

## TPO-0006 (contd)

2 1 In our mind, pre-1972 is among the  
2 least missed -- of the least understood waste  
3 at Hanford. And as a result, I think it has  
4 significant potential to pose significant  
5 threats. And there appears to be no analysis  
6 in this document.

3 7 There is, apparently, no  
8 comprehensive analysis of the impact that  
9 groundwater contamination under the tanks might  
10 pose in the scheme of all the other  
11 contamination that might be eventually caused  
12 by solid waste disposals. And that's  
13 concerning. Those are two technical questions.

14 But we also have some procedural  
15 questions. One of which ought to be addressed  
16 here tonight. And another which probably can't  
17 be addressed, because it would delay this  
18 significantly beyond what DOE wants to see.

4 19 And the first is that we are baffled  
20 by the DOE's refusal to offer an extension of  
21 the public comment period.

22 And I know this has been delayed. I  
23 know that the DOE spent a lot of time on this,  
24 but I have absolutely no sympathy for the DOE  
25 refusing to delay the public comment deadline

42

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES &amp; ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TPO-0006 (contd)

1 by, at a minium of 14 days, and if not a full  
2 month or more. This is a 3,000 page document.

3 Assuming that someone got the  
4 document on the 11th of April and wanted to  
5 read the whole thing by May 27th, that would be  
6 50 to 75 pages a day.

7 And I challenge anyone in this room,  
8 technical or not technical, to read 50 to  
9 75 pages a day for a month and a half and still  
10 be able to retain their sanity.

11 So it's very difficult. I mean, I  
12 plan to read all 3,000 pages, as I read the  
13 whole 800 pages of the first one.

14 Two other members of our group have  
15 also committed to do so, but it's impossible to  
16 prepare thoughtful comments on a comprehensive  
17 basis in that time frame.

18 So I would ask the DOE reconsider  
19 their decisions to reject the extension  
20 requests.

21 And finally, and this is something  
22 that I know DOE cannot address and they will  
23 not address in this system, our formal  
24 testimony last summer was very clear.

25 We acknowledged the fact that there

## TPO-0006 (contd)

5

1 is a need to develop treatment capabilities,  
2 storage treatment and disposal capabilities for  
3 additional waste generated onsite by the  
4 various Hanford cleanup activities. We think  
5 that's reasonable.

6 We do feel very strongly that we  
7 ought to hold off on importation of large  
8 amounts of additional waste from offsite until  
9 we are confident that the most important  
10 treatment facility at Hanford is going to be  
11 constructed and meet capability. And that's  
12 the vitrification plant at Hanford.

13 So we would like to see this  
14 document withdrawn and held in abeyance until  
15 we're convinced that the vit plant will be up  
16 and running on time.

17 So those are our initial formal  
18 comments. We very much appreciate the DOE  
19 coming down here and Mike taking the time to  
20 listen to us.

21 We hope that what we see in reading  
22 the document gives us some additional level of  
23 certainty. I don't think you'll be able to  
24 address all of our concerns, but we do  
25 appreciate your being here. Thanks.

44

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TPO-0007

1 MR. DEE WILLIS: Is there  
2 anybody else that has pressing concerns at home  
3 and wants to speak now? Okay.

4 I want to thank the others of you  
5 who signed up early, came here early, signed up  
6 to speak, and have waited. All right.

7 And the first one of those is Doug  
8 Huston, the state of Oregon.

9 **TPO-0007** MR. DOUG HUSTON: Good evening,  
10 everybody. My name is Doug Huston. And I work  
11 for the state of Oregon, Department of Energy  
12 in the nuclear safety division.

13 And I'm here representing the  
14 Department of Energy and Governor Kulongoski.

15 I'd like to thank the Department of  
16 Energy for holding this public meeting here and  
17 allowing us to give them our comments.

18 And I'd also like to thank them for  
19 the effort they put in in this new document.

1 | 20 We also consider that this is a much-improved  
21 document over the previous one.

22 We had some significant problems  
23 with the previous one. And this one is an  
24 improvement from that.

2 | 25 However, we still have some serious

45

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

## TPO-0007 (contd)

**2**

1 concerns with this document. We don't think  
2 it's comprehensive enough.

3 Although it's 3,000 pages long,  
4 there are still large volumes of waste that it  
5 doesn't analyze.

6 For example, as Doug mentioned, the  
7 pre-1970 TRU waste, it doesn't talk about the  
8 irretrievable tank heels that will remain once  
9 the tank retrievable is done.

10 It doesn't talk about the tanks  
11 themselves, which current plans call for  
12 disposal in a landfill fashion onsite, nor the  
13 ancillary equipment associated with those  
14 tanks.

**3**

15 We're concerned about the tone of  
16 the Environmental Impact Statement also. This  
17 statement was intended to tier down from the  
18 Programmatic EIS, and should have analyzed  
19 whether the decisions made in the Programmatic  
20 EIS were right for Hanford.

21 Instead, it assumes they are right  
22 for Hanford and tries to analyze the impacts.  
23 Those are our major concerns.

24 We're still in the process of  
25 reading the EIS and preparing our comments.

46

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES &amp; ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TPO-0007 (contd); TPO-0008

1 And our final comments will clearly state what  
2 our expectations are for future waste disposal  
3 activities at Hanford and what should be in  
4 this EIS. Thank you very much.

5 MR. DEE WILLIS: Frank  
6 Gearhart.

7 **TPO-0008** MR. FRANK GEARHART: Yes, my  
8 name's Frank Gearhart. And I'm here on behalf  
9 of Citizens for Safe Water and Citizens  
10 interested in Bull Run.

11 We've been in domestic water issues  
12 here since 1985. And I've just got a few  
13 comments and concerns that we'd like to address  
14 here.

15 And mainly I'll point them out as  
16 questions, which I'm sure they're going to be  
17 taken down and maybe they'll be recorded  
18 sometime or other.

19 Number one, we've got concerns about  
20 the length of time the process is taking to  
21 clean up the Hanford complex.

22 As I recall, back in the '80's, the  
23 Congress said "Hey, get busy and clean up  
24 Hanford." Where are we now? We're talking  
25 about putting more waste in there.

47

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

## TPO-0008 (contd)

2 1 And this importing of additional  
2 waste, what are the hazards and, if any,  
3 benefits of adding to the waste storage at  
4 Hanford?

3 5 Has the EIS addressed all potential  
6 containment failures estimated over the next 50  
7 to a hundred years?

4 8 And what are the estimated overall  
9 costs of the clean up? Of course, it sounds  
10 like we're not talking too much about cleanup,  
11 it's just putting some more in there.

12 But what are the overall costs of  
13 the clean up, the burial and containment? If  
14 there are any reliable estimates.

5 15 What are the estimated overall  
16 costs? And are these costs summarized as to  
17 short term, long term, or continuous?

18 Now, if we continue to put stuff in  
19 there, this is going to be an ongoing thing.  
20 And it will drain the treasury or the  
21 taxpayers.

6 22 We, the taxpayers, are concerned  
23 about accountability. Where does  
24 accountability stop in this process?

25 We've got the EPA, the Department of

TPO-0008 (contd); TPO-0009

6

1 Ecology in Washington state, and the Oregon  
2 Departments of Energy, and then there's the  
3 U.S. Congress.

4 Well, I'd like to suggest that we  
5 contact our Senators and our representative and  
6 let our thoughts be known. After all, they're  
7 the ones that make the rules.

8 And these agencies, we can talk  
9 until we're blue in the face, and get nowhere;  
10 right?

11 So where does the safety of the  
12 citizens living in the area, affected by  
13 Hanford, come to its rightful place in the  
14 chain of accountability? Thank you.

15 MR. DEE WILLIS: Sandy Polishuk.

16 **TPO-0009** MS. SANDY POLISHUK: I'm Sandy  
17 Polishuk. I live here in Portland. I've lived  
18 in the Pacific Northwest my entire life except  
19 for one year.

20 I want to tell you a little story  
21 from many years ago when I was in high school.  
22 I used to go on diets.

23 And if on a particular day I  
24 weakened and ate one cookie, I would say "Oh,  
25 the day is ruined," and I would proceed to

49

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TPO-0009 (contd)

1 finish the whole box of cookies.

2 It became evident that this was  
3 false reasoning, because I gained weight on  
4 this diet.

5 And I tell you this story only  
6 because all I can think is that this is the  
7 same sort of reasoning that the DOE looks at  
8 Hanford and says "Oh, the place is ruined. We  
9 might as well put more there."

10 Well, I'm committed to the  
11 Northwest. As I say, I've lived here all my  
12 life. I live within a very short distance of  
13 the Columbia River, so do my grandchildren.

14 And I do not want that river  
15 contaminated. I want Hanford cleaned up, I do  
16 not want it increased. Thank you.

17 I have one more concern I want -- I  
18 have a lot of concerns, but I'm not going to  
19 speak to them all.

20 But the one that I will speak to, as  
21 having lived in Portland for 35 years, in  
22 watching the geometric increase in our traffic  
23 problems.

24 And I think any of you who've lived  
25 here for a few years know that sometimes within

50

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TPO-0009 (contd); TPO-0010

3

1 months you become aware of the added congestion  
2 on our interstate highways.

3 And it's just mind-boggling to think  
4 about those trucks on those crowded highways  
5 and the lack of alternatives to I-5. Thank  
6 you.

7 MR. DEE WILLIS: Pardon me if I  
8 mispronounce this, Lynn -- Lynn Ford.

9 MR. LYNN FORD: I'll just wait.

10 MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. Joyce  
11 Fouingstad?

12 (Ms. Holenstein's comment inaudible,  
13 no microphone. Wanting to speak  
14 at a later time.)

15 MR. DEE WILLIS: You bet.  
16 Pat Timberlake.

17 **TPO-0010** MS. PAT TIMBERLAKE: My name is  
18 Pat Timberlake. I'm a physician, a  
19 naturopathic physician, and a psychotherapist.

20 And I just have a few things to say  
21 tonight, because as I've been listening and I  
22 have read some things, but I'm hearing more and  
23 more facts, I am really appreciative that these  
24 arguments and viewpoints are taking place  
25 today. They are necessary.

51

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345